REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A Request for Continued Examination is filed herewith, together with a petition to revive this application due to an inadvertent abandonment.

Applicants note an error in the Advisory Action of September 27, 2005, insofar as on page 2 thereof, there is reference to "proposed amendment for claims 1, 12". The request for reconsideration of September 9, 2005 contained no proposed amendment.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Official Action of July 6, 2005, relating to the above-identified application.

Claim 1 has been amended to include a number of features. Thus, Claim 1 now recites the DBP number of 40-200 ml/100g from original Claims 8 and 9. The definition of the zeta potential has been corrected as well. The average molecular weight, acid value and amount of the copolymer are now specified. These limitations were not previously recited in any claim. Claim 1 also defines the copolymer as neutralized. No new matter is present. See, page 3, lines 5-11. Claims 12 and 15 have been amended to be consistent therewith. These two claims (12, 15) are similar to Claim 1, except for the transitional "consisting essentially of" and "consisting of", respectively.

The rejection of Claims 1, 3-12, 14, 15 and 17-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kijlstra* (US 5,969,002) taken with *Yamaguchi* (US 6,794,473) is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Official Action admits that the *Kijlstra* patent does not disclose the use of a styrene-acrylic acid copolymer and relies on *Yamaguchi* to show that an acrylic acid salt polymer has excellent dispersability and water solubility and is used in pigment dispersions. However, there

is no disclosure in the *Yamaguchi* patent of (1) a styrene-acrylic acid copolymer, or (2) the specific characteristics thereof as now set forth in the claims. There is a total lack of a reason or suggestion in *Yamaguchi* whereby a person skilled in the art would be motivated to believe that the *Kijlstra* compositions could be improved by the incorporation of a styrene-acrylic acid copolymer of the characteristics defined in the claims herein.

Attention is invited to Table 1, page 5, showing two reference compositions and gas black suspension 1 according to the invention. Figures 1A to 1C show the results obtained. According to the invention, the gas black suspension 1 shown in Figure 1C, displays a significantly higher degree of dispersion than does the reference suspension (Figures 1A and 1B) which contain furnace black.

A copy of these micrographs (in color) is attached hereto and it can clearly be seen that the gas black suspension does not display the large particles as shown in the micrograph of the two furnace black suspensions. See, Figure 1C compared with Figures 1A and 1B.

Further attention is invited to Table 2, page 7, showing three reference suspensions containing gas black, but no styrene-acrylic acid copolymer. Gas black suspension 2 is made in accordance with the invention and <u>does</u> contain the styrene-acrylic acid copolymer.

Enclosed is a copy of Figures 2A-2D in color, showing the difference in degree of dispersion of all four gas black suspensions. The gas black suspension of Figure 2D is clearly unexpectedly better than reference suspension 2A-2C. Note suspension 2 thereby indicating a better dispersion.

It could not have been predicted from the prior art that the presence of the styrene-acrylic acid copolymer could have unexpectedly improve the degree of dispersion compared to other similar gas black suspensions.

It is to be noted further that the combination of the parameters of zeta potential, surface tension, acid value, DBP number is important in being able to achieve the results of the invention. None of the reference suspensions 3, 4 and 5 in Table 3 possess the desired combination of parameters and thus as shown in Figures 2A-2C as a result do not achieve the superior degree of dispersion that characterizes the present invention.

In the absence of a reason, suggestion or motivation to make such a change, applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not create *prima facie* obviousness for the claimed invention. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Favorable action at the Examiner's earliest convenience is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: _____
Robert G. Weilacher, Reg. No. 20,531

Suite 3100, Promenade II
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3592
Telephone: (404): 815-3593
Facsimile: (404): 685-6893